

made a stand against a similar partisan power grab. Just as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) called the Federal Aviation Administration to track down those Democrats, just as the Department of Homeland Security went after a cotton farmer from Texas to find out about his airplane, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) today diverted the Capitol Police from their important work in preserving public safety here in the Nation's capital for partisan political purposes.

This attempt to break up a meeting of Ways and Means Democrats is unprecedented for either party I believe in the history of this Congress. We did not walk out as our Texas State legislative colleagues so justly did. We attempted to walk into the process, having been handed moments before a bill that affects the pensions and the retirement security of millions of Americans, Republicans and Democrats, across this country, but yet as we attempted to walk into that process and develop and present our alternatives, the police were called here in the Capitol to stop us from doing that job.

Americans who share the concern of the abuse, indeed of the extremism, of the majority need to be concerned about what happened here. It was not some fight among Members of Congress acting childish was a serious infringement on our democracy. Americans who are worried about us becoming a Nation of citizens who are supposed to choose between saying "me too" and shutting up, these Americans cannot afford to be silent. No party, no person has a monopoly on the truth.

Dissent is not some inconvenience in this Congress or in this country, and it certainly does not warrant calling out the Feds, whether it is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) calling out for the G-men in Texas or the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) calling out for the Capitol Police in Washington.

It is the cornerstone of our democracy that we have dissent and differences of opinion in this country, and yet it is the strength of our democracy. We will not be intimidated. We will not back down. Too many Americans, working families who need our help, also need our voice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SANDLIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ANTI-AMERICANISM ACCORDING TO NEWT GINGRICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday this House of Representatives passed legislation to authorize funding for the Department of State, for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, and to provide direction and guidance in the area of foreign policy. We are fortunate indeed to have hundreds of men and women working for the State Department here and around the world who have dedicated their lives to public service and are committed to serving our country at home and abroad.

These public servants had been recently subjected to outrageous and unwarranted attacks by the former Speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich. In a scurrilous article in the current issue of Foreign Policy, entitled *Rogue State Department*, and in an earlier speech he gave before the American Enterprise Institute, Mr. Gingrich accuses the men and women of the State Department of nothing less than undermining the status and respect of the United States around the world.

In his article, Mr. Gingrich asserts that the cause of rising anti-American sentiment around the world is that the men and women of the State Department have "abdicated values and principles in favor of accommodation and passivity." He accuses them of propping up dictators, coddling the corrupt and ignoring secret police abuse around the world. This from the man who was Speaker of this House, led this body in a three to one vote against President Clinton's Bosnia policy, a policy that started the process leading to the overthrow of the war criminal Mr. Milosevic.

Mr. Gingrich's article piggybacks on an earlier speech he gave before the American Enterprise Institute here in Washington in which he claimed the State Department was engaging in a quote "deliberate and systematic effort to undermine President Bush's foreign policy." These are extremely serious charges. Before making such serious charges, one would think that a person who wanted to be taken seriously would provide some credible evidence. He does not.

Let us start with the fact that it is the President of the United States, not the foreign service or any other career civil servants, who selects the top policy-makers at the Department of State, beginning with the Secretary of State. Indeed, the top jobs in State Department are awarded to political ap-

pointees of the President, starting with Secretary of State Colin Powell. They are the captains of the ship. They set the vision, they establish the policies and they give the orders.

If Mr. Gingrich believes what he writes, that the State Department is a culture that props up dictators, coddles the corrupt and ignores secret police, then his complaint is with President Bush who appointed the political team at the Department and who are charged with ensuring that the policies of the President are carried out.

The fact of the matter is Mr. Gingrich provides not one single example in his article of where the career foreign service or other civil servants of the Department of State have refused to carry out the policies established by the Secretary of State and the President.

What does he refer to as exhibit A in his capital case against the men and women of our State Department? He points to an internal analysis done by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. That is the bureau within the Department of State responsible for analyzing intelligence information we collect and analyzing that information, and he suggests that the Bureau of Intelligence and Research and that that information, that some of the information collected, that our post-war challenges in Iraq are more daunting than President Bush's sunny rhetoric suggests.

Specifically, in a portion of his article entitled *Out of Sync*, he contrasts statements made in a speech given by President Bush to statements made in an internal, confidential assessment by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. In a speech in Dearborn, Michigan, the President stated, "I have confidence in the future of a free Iraq. The Iraqi people are fully capable of self-government." The internal State Department analysis reportedly stated that "Liberal democracy would be difficult to achieve in Iraq," and that "electoral democracy were to emerge, could well be subject to exploitation by anti-American elements."

One does not have to be a rocket scientist to understand that the statements made in the INR memo are reasonable conclusions. The facts on the ground in Iraq have demonstrated clearly that liberal democracy would be difficult to achieve in Iraq, not impossible, but certainly difficult. It is a challenge ahead.

It is also obvious that elections in Iraq could be exploited by anti-American Islamic fundamentalist forces.

□ 1730

That does not mean we should not support elections. Of course we should. But we should be clear-eyed about the possible consequences.

The important point here is not so much that Mr. Gingrich is blind to the obvious accuracy of these assessments that were made in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The issue is